

Applicant : Christopher A. Rygaard
Serial No. : 09/764,548
Filed : January 18, 2001
Page : 6 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 18511-007001

REMARKS

Claims 22-40 were pending. Claims 22-28 and 36-40 are allowed. Claim 29-33 and 35 stand rejected. Claim 34 is objected to as being dependent from a rejected claim. Applicant amended claim 29 and canceled claim 34. Claims 22-33 and 35-40 are now pending, of which claims 22, 29, and 36 are independent. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 29-33 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(a) as being anticipated by Jansen et al., *Mobile Agent Security*, NIST Special Publication 800-19. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant amended claim 29 to incorporate the limitation of claim 34, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten to independent form. For at least the reasons that claim 34 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29 and claims depending from claim 29 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.